

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

STANDARD PROCESS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

THE ANTITREND LLC, DANIEL EARLE,  
and JOHN DOES 1–100,

19-cv-99-jdp

Defendants.

---

This is a trademark case against an on-line vendor. The two named defendants, Daniel Earle and The Antitrend LLC, moved to dismiss or transfer the case. Dkt. 7. I denied that motion in a 17-page opinion that addressed jurisdictional issues that commonly arise in cases involving e-commerce. Dkt. 7. Defendants made an interlocutory appeal. Dkt. 28.

That appeal has been voluntarily dismissed, Dkt. 32, which suggests that the parties have settled. Defendants ask me to vacate my opinion and order on jurisdiction. Dkt. 33. Plaintiff, Standard Process, Inc., does not oppose the request.

Defendants say that vacating my order would save judicial resources and serve the parties' interests. But they do not explain how. Defendants also say that vacating my order would encourage settlements in general, but they don't explain that either. When it is truly in the interests of the parties—and more importantly, the public—I would vacate an opinion and order. Defendants haven't given me a good reason to do so here.

The opinions of a district court are not precedential. But the analysis of a district court can provide useful guidance to other courts and to the public, if the analysis is sound and clearly expressed. Whether my opinion will be a useful contribution to the law of personal

jurisdiction I leave to others. But the opinion belongs to the public, and I will not undermine what value it has by vacating it. The motion is denied.

Entered September 1, 2020.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

---

JAMES D. PETERSON  
District Judge